DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 412 TM 012 405

AUTHOR Stolworthy, Reed L.
TITLE Preservice Teacher Education Assessments: Testing the Null Hypothesis.
PUB DATE 1 Jul 88
NOTE 73p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analysis of Variance; Educational Assessment; Higher Education; *Hypothesis Testing; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Statistical Analysis; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teaching Skills; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Null Hypothesis; *Variance (Statistical)

ABSTRACT

To determine the analysis of variance among different assessments of teaching competencies shown by preservice education students as student teachers, 32 undergraduates certified in 1985 and 42 from 1986 were studied. Data were obtained on their self-evaluations of 25 teaching competencies. Evaluations by their cooperating teachers (35 in fall 1985 and 48 in spring 1986) and university supervisors (34 in fall 1985 and 41 in spring 1986) were also studied. The statistical null hypothesis was that no differences would be found among the means derived from students assessing their own competencies and that no differences would be found among the means of cooperating teachers' evaluations and supervisors' evaluations. The null hypothesis was rejected relative to the assessment of seven competencies and retained for interpreting the statistical meaning of no significant differences in the different assessments of the remaining 18 competencies. Fifty-one tables present study findings. The rating questionnaires are also attached. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300412

SP

PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION ASSESSMENTS: TESTING THE NULL HYPOTHESIS

SUBMITTED BY

DR. REED L. STOLWORTHY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Reed L. Stolworthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JULY 1, 1988

TM012 405

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. 3

Problem Statement 4

Research Design 4

The Mean Values and Analysis of Variance. 6

The Null Hypothesis 6

The Chance Probability. 7

Estimates of Experimental Error 8

Estimates of Treatment Effects. 8

Evaluating the F-Ratio. 10

The Level of Significance 11

Conclusion. 13

Appendix A. 15

Tables 1-25

The Mean and Standard Deviation

Appendix B. 41

Tables 26-50

The Analysis of Variance

Multiple Comparisons: Scheffe's LSD

A Matrix of Probabilities

Appendix C. 67

Table 51

Summary Table Listing Levels of Significance

for Variance Among Evaluators

Appendix D. 69

The Evaluative Instruments

PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION ASSESSMENTS: TESTING THE NULL HYPOTHESIS

This study of potential first year teachers involved a population of 32 (n = 32) undergraduates certified to teach by Washburn University's teacher preparation program during Fall Semester of 1985 and 42 (n = 42) undergraduates during the Spring semester of 1986 for a total of 74 (N = 74) undergraduates. Data were obtained relative to the undergraduates' self evaluation regarding the ability to demonstrate twenty-five teaching competencies. In addition, the student teaching evaluations completed during the Fall of 1985 and the Spring of 1986 by the above undergraduates' cooperating teacher(s) (n = 35, Fall 1985 and n = 48, Spring 1986) and university supervisor (n = 34, Fall 1985 and n = 41, Spring 1986) were also included regarding the evaluation of the very same teaching-learning competencies.

The evaluative instrument applied in the study contained a rating scale from 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in the particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be checked if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate the competency.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the analysis of variance found existing among the different assessments of teaching competencies demonstrated by preservice teacher education students as student teachers. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What are the self-evaluations of student teachers in regards to twenty-five competencies related to the teaching-learning process?
2. What are the evaluations relative to the performance of these same student teachers as measured with the same rating scale by their respective cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor(s)?
3. Are there any significant differences between the self-evaluation conducted by the student teacher, and the respective evaluations of the student teacher as dervived from the cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor(s)?

Research Design

Each evaluative instrument utilized in the study was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The

respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be checked if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency (Appendix D).

At the end of student teaching, the student teacher, cooperating teacher,and university supervisor completed the rating scale containing the same criteria related to the teaching-learning process. The data were obtained from the above and tabulated and analyzed on the computer. The quantitative results were expressed through descriptive and inferential statistics.

It can readily be noticed that the left hand column of Tables 1 through 25 (Appendix A) lists the numbers on the rating scale with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. In addition, the respondents were to check NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be checked if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency. The numbers listed across the tables indicate the number of responses received at each of the points on the rating scale by each of the respective groups. The means and standard deviations for each of the competencies are listed at the bottom of each table.

The Mean Values and Analysis of Variance

In order to determine the mean values, the individual ratings received from each student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor were summed and divided by the number of respondents, respectively. Table 1 through 25 (Appendix A) show the mean scores and standard deviations for the twenty-five competencies related to teaching as represented by the Fall, 1985 and Spring, 1986 student teachers. Mean scores were obtained in regards to the student teacher's perception of his/her competencies related to the teaching-learning process. Tables 26-50 (Appendix B) illustrate the multiple comparisons of the above three groups of evaluators as provided through the application of the analysis of variance by using Scheffe's levels of significant differences (LSD). A matrix of probabilities was obtained for each competency through the multiple comparisons provided in Scheffe's LSD relative to the above groups of evaluators assessing the competence of the Fall 1985 and Spring 1986 student teachers.

The Null Hypothesis

The null hypothesis was applied as a statistical test for this study. The null hypothesis was utilized in order to specify the values of a particular parameter (the mean for example) in the different treatment populations. As noted by Keppel (1982), the null hypothesis typically chosen gives the same value to the different populations. The null

hypothesis states that no difference will be found between the descriptive statistics compared in one's research study (Borg and Gull, 1983). Thus, the null hypothesis of this study stated that no difference would be found between the means derived from the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors relative to the application of the rating scale to the twenty-five competencies related to the teaching-learning process as exemplified in the undergraduates (Tables 1 through 25). Whereas, the research hypothesis of this study stated that significant differences would be found occurring at the .05 level of significance (e.g. $p =< .05$) among the means of the above respondents included in the study.

The Chance Probability

Keppel explained that the making of the decision concerning the acceptability of the null hypothesis is based upon a consideration of the chance probability associated with the ratio actually found in the experiment. If the probability of obtaining by chance a ratio of this size or larger is reasonably low, we should reject the null hypothesis. On the other hand, if the probability is high, we should not reject, or, in essence, we will accept the null hypothesis.

Estimates of Experimental Error

Statisticians are able to estimate the extent to which the difference we observe among the group means are due to

experimental error. This estimation puts us in a position to begin to consider the evaluation of the hypothesis that the means of the treatment populations are equal. If we assume that the experimental error is the same for the different treatment conditions, we can obtain a more stable estimate of this quantity by pooling and averaging these estimates. Therefore, under these circumstances, -- an experiment conducted when the null hypothesis is true -- differences among sample means will also reflect the operation of experimental error (Keppel, 1982).

Estimates of Treatment Effects

Keppel explained that whenever the null hypothesis is false, there are real differences among the means of the treatment populations. Assuming that the subjects in each treatment group are drawn randomly from corresponding treatment populations, the means of the different groups in the experiment should reflect the differences in the population means. The mere fact that the null hypothesis is false does not imply that experimental error has vanished. The only change is that there is now an additional component contributing to the differences among the means, a systematic component as opposed to an unsystematic one, namely treatment effects.

Keppel also emphasized that the differences among treatment means may reflect two different quantities: when the population means are equal, the differences among the

group means will reflect the operation of experimental error alone, but when the population means are not equal, the differences among the group means will reflect the operation of an unsystematic component and a systematic component, i.e., experimental error and treatment effects, respectively.

According to Borg and Gull, the null hypothesis can be rejected when the mean difference exceeds the mean difference that we would find once in a hundred 0.01 or once in a thousand 0.001 or once in ten thousand 0.0001 samples if the population mean difference was zero. Keppel provided pertinent information relative to the chance probability associated with the use of the null hypothesis. It was explained by Keppel that we can always attribute some portion of the differences we observe among treatment means to chance factors. All uncontrolled sources of variability in an experiment are considered potential contributors to experimental error. In the behavioral sciences the most important source of experimental error is that due to individual differences. Variations in the various features of the testing environment can also contribute to uncontrolled variability. Another source of experimental error mentioned by Keppel was what may be called measurement error. A misreading of a dial, a misjudgment that a particular type of behavior has occurred, the variability in reaction time of an experimenter timing a given bit of

behavior, and an error in transposing observations recorded in the laboratory to summary worksheets used in performing the statistical analyses are all included in this classification. According to Sowell and Casey (1982), the null hypothesis states in effect that any relationship observed is likely the result of random variation within the population.

Evaluating the F-Ratio

For the purposes of this study, the null hypothesis was stated, the data was collected and the F-Ratio was calculated. The judgment was also made relative to whether the F-Ratio was incompatible with the hypothesis that the means of the treatment populations were equal. According to Keppel, incompatibility is defined arbitrarily ahead of time as an F value which would occur on the basis of chance, assuming that the null hypothesis is true, a small portion of the time, 1 time in 20 (5 percent). If the F value observed falls within the statistical region of incompatibility, we reject the null hypothesis; if it statistically falls within the region of compatibility, we do not reject the null hypothesis.

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was chosen because it addresses the question: Is there a significant difference between any two population means? If the F value that is calculated is large enough, then the null hypothesis (meaning there is no difference between the groups) can be

rejected with confidence that the researcher is correct in concluding that at least two means are different. When a researcher uses ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that three or more means are not the same, the resulting F ratio and level of significance tells the researcher only that the combination of the means is different. It fails to indicate which groups are different. The researcher needs to employ further statistical tests that will indicate those means that are different from each other. These tests are called post hoc comparisons or multiple comparisons. They are designed to test each possible pair of means (McMillan and Schumacher, 1984). Thus, for the purposes of this study, Scheffe's LSD multiple comparison test was applied to comparing the means of all three groups of respondents (Tables 26 through 50).

The Level of Significance

Fortunately, the level of significance tells us the chance probability of finding differences between the means. If the difference between the means is larger, then the probability (p) value is smaller, since the chance of getting means farther apart, when we assume the means are in fact the same, is less than the chance that the means are closer together. The lower the level of significance, therefore, the more confidence we have that we are safe in rejecting the null. A level of 0.01 is therefore better than 0.05, 0.001 better than .01, and 0.05 better than 0.10.

A (p) value between 0.05 and 0.10 is usually thought of as marginally significant, and anything greater than 0.10 is labeled a nonsignificant difference. We are saying, then, that if there is one chance out of ten of being wrong in rejecting the null (one chance in ten that the means are the same) then that is too much risk to take in saying that the means are different. In other words, the results may be due to error than to the treatment (McMillan and Schumacher, 1984).

Tables 25 through 50 (Appendix B) illustrate the results of the application of the analysis of variance (ANOVA). The variance was identified relative to the separation of the total variance into two main sources of variation. The two main sources of variance utilized in ANOVA are: (1) systematic variance, labeled between groups variance and (2) error variance, derived from within groups.

Tables 25 through 50 (Appendix B) also show the matrix of probabilities illustrated through the application of Scheffe's multiple comparisons for each of the mean scores of Fall semester 1985 and Spring Semester 1986 to the mean scores derived from the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. The variability which occurred within this study was depicted through taking into account the size and location of each individual score in terms of each respective mean score derived from the three

groups of respondents. Table 51 (Appendix C) lists the differences found among and within the various mean scores. It can readily be noticed that the assessments of the specific competencies were significantly different in the evaluation of six competencies. Thus, for the purposes of this study, the null hypothesis of no difference should be rejected regarding the significant differences found in assessing the seven competencies and not rejected for the application of the same rating scale to the remaining eighteen competencies.

Conclusion

The statistical null hypothesis of this study was that no differences would be found among the means derived from student teachers assessing their own competencies related to the teaching-learning process. The null hypothesis also stated that no differences would be found among the means of the cooperating teachers' evaluations and university supervisors' evaluations as they applied the same rating scale to the same student teachers relative to the twenty-five competencies.

In order to make the statistical interpretation in inferential statistics, the research hypothesis of this study was that significant differences would be found at the .05 level of probability relative to all the above

evaluations. Table 51 (Appendix D) shows that the greatest probability level occurred at the .0003 level. Further, six other significant differences were found below the .05 level. Thus, for the purposes of this study, the statistical null hypothesis of no significant difference should be rejected relative to the application of the rating scale in the assessment of seven competencies and retained for interpreting the statistical meaning of no significant differences in the different assessments related to the remaining eighteen competencies.

References

Keppel, G., Design & Analysis: A Researcher's Handbook, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

McMillan, J. H., and S. Schumacher, Research in Education:A Conceptual Introduction, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1984.

Sowell, E.J., and R.J. Casey, Research Methods in Education, Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1982.

Steven F. Austin State University, School of Education, Program Evaluation, 1982-83. Nacogdoches. Texas, 1983.

APPENDIX A
TABLES 1-25
THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION

TABLE 1

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 1-PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	0	1	1
3	1	0	1	3	2	0
4	6	11	4	6	5	11
5	25	31	29	38	25	27
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	1	1	2
Mean	4.75	4.74	4.74	4.74	4.64	4.64
Standard Deviation	0.51	0.45	0.66	0.57	0.74	0.63

TABLE 2

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 2-MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	1	0
2	0	0	2	1	0	1
3	2	2	2	4	4	3
4	9	12	5	13	8	16
5	21	28	26	30	21	21
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.59	4.62	4.57	4.50	4.41	4.39
Standard Deviation	0.61	0.58	0.85	0.74	0.92	0.74

TABLE 3

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 3-CONFIDENCE IN ABILITY TO TEACH

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	1	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	3	1	1	0
3	1	1	1	4	6	7
4	14	18	11	16	13	14
5	17	22	19	27	13	20
Competent						
NA	0	0	1	0	1	0
Mean	4.50	4.43	4.35	4.44	4.15	4.32
Standard Deviation	0.57	0.77	0.92	0.74	0.83	0.76

TABLE 4

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 4-MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	1	0	0
3	0	1	1	1	2	1
4	7	14	6	8	8	11
5	25	27	26	37	23	29
Competent						
NA	0	0	1	1	1	0
Mean	4.78	4.62	4.68	4.72	4.64	4.68
Standard Deviation	0.42	0.54	0.68	0.62	0.60	0.52

TABLE 5

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 5-COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN CLASSROOM

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	2	1	1	2
3	1	3	2	7	4	6
4	16	19	11	11	14	13
5	13	19	19	27	14	19
Competent						
NA	2	1	1	2	1	2
Mean	4.40	4.39	4.38	4.39	4.24	4.22
Standard Deviation	0.56	0.63	0.85	0.83	0.79	0.89

TABLE 6

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 6-PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

Incom--	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	1	0
2	0	2	0	0	0	0
3	4	3	2	1	0	3
4	7	7	3	2	0	3
5	13	16	9	17	2	5
Competent						
NA	8	14	11	28	31	30
Mean	4.38	4.32	4.50	4.80	3.67	4.18
Standard Deviation	0.77	0.94	0.76	0.52	2.31	0.87

TABLE 7

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 7-REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 85	Sp.86	Fall 85	Sp.86	Fall 85	Sp. 86
	N=32	N=42	N=35	N=48	N=34	N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	1	2
3	0	1	3	2	0	1
4	3	8	2	7	5	13
5	29	33	29	38	27	25
Competent						
NA	0	0	1	1	1	0
Mean	4.91	4.76	4.76	4.77	4.76	4.49
Standard						
Deviation	0.30	0.48	0.61	0.52	0.61	0.78

TABLE 8

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 8-PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	1	2
3	0	0	2	3	1	1
4	8	10	7	6	2	4
5	23	32	26	39	28	29
Competent						
NA	1	0	0	0	2	5
Mean	4.74	4.76	4.69	4.75	4.78	4.67
Standard Deviation	0.44	0.43	0.58	0.56	0.66	0.79

TABLE 9

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 9-PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 85	Sp.86	Fall 85	Sp.86	Fall 85	Sp. 86
	N=32	N=42	N=35	N=48	N=34	N=41
1	0	0	0	1	0	1
2	0	1	0	0	0	1
3	0	4	2	2	1	1
4	10	12	5	4	0	1
5	22	20	24	33	18	15
Competent						
NA	0	5	4	8	15	22
Mean	4.69	4.38	4.71	4.70	4.89	4.47
Standard						
Deviation	0.47	0.79	0.59	0.79	0.46	1.17

TABLE 10

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 10-USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	1	0
2	0	1	1	0	0	0
3	1	1	2	5	2	3
4	12	13	6	10	12	23
5	19	27	26	33	17	14
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	2	1
Mean	4.56	4.57	4.63	4.58	4.38	4.28
Standard Deviation	0.56	0.67	0.73	0.68	0.87	0.60

TABLE 11

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 11-DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	1	0
2	0	0	1	0	0	1
3	4	2	2	5	2	4
4	11	18	8	14	9	23
5	17	21	23	26	15	13
Competent						
NA	0	1	1	3	7	0
Mean	4.41	4.46	4.56	4.47	4.37	4.17
Standard Deviation	0.71	0.60	0.75	0.69	0.93	0.70

TABLE 12

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 12-DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	1	0
2	0	0	1	0	1	1
3	3	4	4	6	3	6
4	11	14	7	10	9	21
5	18	24	23	32	19	13
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.47	4.48	4.49	4.54	4.33	4.12
Standard Deviation	0.67	0.67	0.82	0.71	0.99	0.75

TABLE 13

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 13-OBTAIN APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	1	0	1	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	1
3	2	2	2	4	3	5
4	13	12	6	9	10	26
5	17	27	26	33	19	9
Competent						
NA	0	1	0	1	1	0
Mean	4.47	4.61	4.60	4.57	4.39	4.05
Standard Deviation	0.62	0.59	0.85	0.74	0.90	0.67

TABLE 14

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 14-CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	1	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	0	2	1
3	2	2	1	7	2	5
4	16	21	13	14	15	21
5	14	19	19	27	14	14
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.38	4.40	4.37	4.42	4.24	4.17
Standard Deviation	0.61	0.59	0.91	0.74	0.83	0.74

TABLE 15

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 15-PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85	Sp.86	Fall 85	Sp.86	Fall 85	Sp. 86
	N=32	N=42	N=35	N=48	N=34	N=41
0	0	0	0	1	0	
2	0	0	2	0	0	1
3	2	3	2	7	1	5
4	14	21	9	11	17	18
5	16	18	22	30	14	17
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.44	4.36	4.46	4.48	4.30	4.24
Standard Deviation	0.62	0.62	0.85	0.74	0.81	0.77

TABLE 16

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 16-MANAGES CLASSROOM FACILITIES EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	1	0
2	0	0	1	0	0	2
3	3	1	1	9	1	3
4	11	15	9	10	9	12
5	18	25	24	29	22	24
Competent						
NA	0	1	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.47	4.59	4.60	4.42	4.55	4.41
Standard Deviation	0.67	0.55	0.69	0.79	0.83	0.84

TABLE 17

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 17-MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	0	0	1	3	1	2
3	2	5	4	7	2	5
4	18	15	12	12	16	12
5	12	22	18	26	13	21
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	2	0
Mean	4.31	4.40	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.22
Standard Deviation	0.59	0.70	0.80	0.94	0.73	1.01

TABLE 18

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 18-DEVELOP APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	0	1	0
3	2	2	2	4	2	1
4	13	16	9	11	4	18
5	16	22	20	31	4	8
Competent						
NA	1	2	3	2	23	14
Mean	4.45	4.50	4.50	4.59	4.00	4.26
Standard Deviation	0.62	0.60	0.76	0.65	1.00	0.53

TABLE 19

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 19-ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	0	1	0
3	0	1	2	1	1	1
4	11	12	8	17	3	10
5	19	28	22	29	10	9
Competent						
NA	2	1	2	1	19	21
Mean	4.63	4.66	4.55	4.60	4.47	4.40
Standard Deviation	0.49	0.53	0.75	0.54	0.92	0.60

TABLE 20

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 20-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	0	0	0
3	1	1	1	4	0	2
4	5	7	7	6	3	7
5	17	27	16	29	15	16
Competent						
NA	9	6	10	9	16	16
Mean	4.70	4.67	4.63	4.64	4.83	4.56
Standard Deviation	0.56	0.68	0.58	0.67	0.38	0.65

TABLE 21

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 21-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teaches		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 85	Sp.86	Fall 85	Sp.86	Fall 85	Sp. 86
	N=32	N=42	N=35	N=48	N=34	N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	0	0	0
3	2	1	0	0	0	1
4	4	5	5	1	3	5
5	12	15	10	16	2	12
Competent						
NA	14	20	20	31	29	13
Mean	4.56	4.55	4.67	4.94	4.40	4.61
Standard						
Deviation	0.70	0.80	0.49	0.24	0.55	0.61

TABLE 22

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 22-DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	1	2	4	2	4
4	7	6	6	12	8	11
5	21	35	27	32	22	24
Competent						
NA	2	0	0	0	2	2
Mean	4.60	4.81	4.71	4.58	4.63	4.51
Standard Deviation	0.72	0.45	0.57	0.65	0.61	0.68

TABLE 23

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 23-COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	0	0	0
3	1	2	1	5	0	1
4	12	10	9	14	5	7
5	16	23	23	25	9	11
Competent						
NA	3	7	1	4	20	22
Mean	4.52	4.60	4.59	4.45	4.64	4.53
Standard Deviation	0.57	0.60	0.70	0.70	0.50	0.61

TABLE 24

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 24-COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Incom-petent	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	0	1	1	1	2
4	3	3	5	5	2	8
5	26	36	28	40	23	29
Competent						
NA	3	3	1	1	8	2
Mean	4.90	4.92	4.79	4.79	4.85	4.69
Standard Deviation	0.31	0.27	0.48	0.59	0.46	0.57

TABLE 25

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 25-MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL, OPEN MINDEDNESS, FLEXIBILITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 85 N=32	Sp.86 N=42	Fall 85 N=35	Sp.86 N=48	Fall 85 N=34	Sp. 86 N=41
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	0	2	0	1	2
4	4	10	10	9	9	10
5	24	32	23	39	21	29
Competent						
NA	3	0	0	0	3	0
Mean	4.79	4.76	4.60	4.81	4.65	4.66
Standard Deviation	0.49	0.43	0.60	0.39	0.55	0.57

APPENDIX B
TABLES 26-50
THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

TABLE 26

PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.545	*.0003
Cooperating Teachers	**.545	1.000	*.0003
University Supervisors	*.0003	*.0003	1.000

*p< .0003 level of significance

**p< .545 or .55 level of significance

TABLE 27

MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.241	*.017
Cooperating Teachers	.241	1.000	**.055
University Supervisors	*.017	**.055	1.000

*p< .017 or .02 level of significance

**p< .055 or .06 level of significance

TABLE 28
CONFIDENCE IN THE ABILITY TO TEACH
MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES
RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.731	*.151
Cooperating Teachers	.731	1.000	**.302
University Supervisors	*.151	**.302	1.000

*p< .151 or .15 level of significance

**p< .302 or .30 level of significance

TABLE 29

MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	**1.000	**1.000	*.853
Cooperating Teachers	**1.000	**1.000	*.853
University Supervisors	*.853	*.853	**1.000

*p< .853 or .85 level of significance

**p<1.000 or 1.00 level of significance

TABLE 30

COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN THE CLASSROOM

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.651	*.001
Cooperating Teachers	**.651	**1.000	*.001
University Supervisors	*.001	*.001	1.000

*p< .001 level of significance

**p<.651 or.65 level of significance

TABLE 31

PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIATION

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.541	**.348
Cooperating Teachers	.541	1.000	*.127
University Supervisors	**.348	*.127	1.000

*p< .127 or .13 level of significance

**p<.348 or.35 level of significance

TABLE 32

REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.863	*.375
Cooperating Teachers	.863	1.000	**.598
University Supervisors	*.375	**.598	1.000

*p< .375 or .38 level of significance

**p<.598 or.60 level of significance

TABLE 33

PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.852	**.893
Cooperating Teachers	*.852	1.000	.996
University Supervisors	**.893	.996	1.000

*p< .852 or .85 level of significance

**p(.893 or.89 level of significance

TABLE 34

PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.750	**.806
Cooperating Teachers	*.750	1.000	.994
University Supervisors	**.806	.994	1.000

*p< .750 or .75 level of significance

**p<.806 or.81 level of significance

TABLE 35

USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.713	**.032
Cooperating Teachers	.713	1.000	*.021
University Supervisors	**.032	*.021	1.000

*p< .021 or .02 level of significance

**p<.032 or.03 level of significance

TABLE 36

DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERSTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.714	**.334
Cooperating Teachers	.714	1.000	*.162
University Supervisors	**.334	*.162	1.000

*p< .162 or .16 level of significance

**p<.334 or.33 level of significance

TABLE 37

DEVELOPES LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.905	**.142
Cooperating Teachers	.905	1.000	*.102
University Supervisors	**.142	*.102	1.000

*p< .102 or .10 level of significance

**p<.142 or.14 level of significance

TABLE 38

OBTAINS APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.958	**.252
Cooperating Teachers	.958	1.000	*.197
University Supervisors	**.252	*.197	1.000

*p< .197 or .20 level of significance

**p<.252 or.25 level of significance

TABLE 39

CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.992	**.032
Cooperating Teachers	.992	1.000	*.030
University Supervisors	**.032	*.030	1.000

*p< .030 or .03 level of significance

**p<.032 or.03 level of significance

TABLE 40

PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.370	**.115
Cooperating Teachers	.370	1.000	*.039
University Supervisors	**.115	*.039	1.000

*p< .039 or .04 level of significance

**p<.115 or.12 level of significance

TABLE 41

MANAGES CLASSROOMS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.984	*.896
Cooperating Teachers	.984	1.000	**.962
University Supervisors	*.896	**.962	1.000

*p< .896 or .90 level of significance

**p<.962 or.96 level of significance

TABLE 42

MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.675	*.281
Cooperating Teachers	.675	1.000	**.629
University Supervisors	*.281	**.629	1.000

*$p < .281$ or .28 level of significance

**$p < .629$ or .63 level of significance

TABLE 43

DEVELOPES APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.837	**.123
Cooperating Teachers	.837	1.000	*.080
University Supervisors	**.123	*.080	1.000

*p< .080 or .08 level of significance

**p<.123 or.12 level of significance

TABLE 44

ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD. - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.310	*.025
Cooperating Teachers	.310	1.000	**.073
University Supervisors	*.025	**.073	1.000

*p< .025 or .03 level of significance

**p<.073 or.07 level of significance

TABLE 45

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.906	.997
Cooperating Teachers	**.906	1.000	*.869
University Supervisors	.997	*.869	1.000

*p< .869 or .87 level of significance

**p<.906 or.91 level of significance

TABLE 46

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.336	.939
Cooperating Teachers	**.336	1.000	*.247
University Supervisors	.939	*.247	1.000

*p< .247 or .25 level of significance

**p<.336 or.34 level of significance

TABLE 47

DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.871	*.555
Cooperating Teachers	.871	1.000	**.811
University Supervisors	*.555	**.811	1.000

*p< .555 or .56 level of significance

**p<.811 or.81 level of significance

TABLE 48

COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.885	.954
Cooperating Teachers	**.885	1.000	*.741
University Supervisors	.954	*.741	1.000

*p< .741 or .74 level of significance

**p<.885 or.89 level of significance

TABLE 49

COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.327	*.252
Cooperating Teachers	**.327	1.000	.956
University Supervisors	*.252	.956	1.000

*p< .252 or .25 level of significance

**p<.327 or.33 level of significance

TABLE 50

MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL OPEN-MINDEDNESS, AND FLEXIBILITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.745	*.478
Cooperating Teachers	**.745	1.000	.857
University Supervisors	*.478	.853	1.000

*p< .478 or .48 level of significance

**p<.745 or.75 level of significance

APPENDIX C
SUMMARY TABLE LISTING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS

TABLE 51

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1986 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Significance Level	Evaluators Showing the Greatest Variance From Each Other
Practices Professional Ethics	.0003	Uni. Super. - Coop. Teach. and St.Teach.
Communicates Effectively	.001	Uni. Super. - Coop. Teach. and St.Teach.
Maintains Enthusiasm	.02	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Resources for Teaching	.02	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Strategies for Teaching	.03	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Interprets Pupil Progress	.03	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Presents Lessons Effectively	.04	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Develops Evaluation Devices	.08	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Develops Lesson Plans	.10	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Professional Organizations	.13	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Confidence in Ability	.15	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Determines Student Needs	.16	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Resources for Teaching	.20	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Work with Exceptional Student	.25	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Cooperates with School	.25	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Manages Classroom Behavior	.28	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Profits from Suggestions	.38	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Personal Behavior	.48	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Develops Rapport	.56	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Counsels Students Effectively	.74	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
School Activities	.75	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Appearance	.85	University Supervisor - Student Teacher
Practices Punctuality	.85	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Works with Various Cultures	.87	University Supervisor - Coop. Teacher
Manages Classroom Facilities	.90	University Supervisor - Student Teacher

APPENDIX D
THE EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: In order to evaluate your performance during student teaching, please rate your competence on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not perform a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics						
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching						
3. Confidence in ability to teach						
4. Maintain professional appearance						
5. Communicate effectively in classroom						
6. Participate in professional organization						
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions						
8. Practice punctuality						
9. Participate in school activities						
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons						
11. Determine student needs and interests						
12. Develop long-range and daily plans						
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching						
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching						
15. Present lessons effectively						
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively						
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively						
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices						
19. Assess and interpret student progress						
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures						
21. Work effectively with exceptional students						
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students						
23. Counsel students appropriately						
24. Cooperate with all school personnel						
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.						

Comments:

_____
Student's Signature

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Confidence in ability to teach	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Maintain professional appearance	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Communicate effectively in classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Participate in professional organization	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions	___	___	___	___	___	___
8. Practice punctuality	___	___	___	___	___	___
9. Participate in school activities	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons	___	___	___	___	___	___
11. Determine student needs and interests	___	___	___	___	___	___
12. Develop long-range and daily plans	___	___	___	___	___	___
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
15. Present lessons effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices	___	___	___	___	___	___
19. Assess and interpret student progress	___	___	___	___	___	___
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures	___	___	___	___	___	___
21. Work effectively with exceptional students	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students	___	___	___	___	___	___
23. Counsel students appropriately	___	___	___	___	___	___
24. Cooperate with all school personnel	___	___	___	___	___	___
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

_____
Cooperating Teacher

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Confidence in ability to teach	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Maintain professional appearance	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Communicate effectively in classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Participate in professional organization	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions	___	___	___	___	___	___
8. Practice punctuality	___	___	___	___	___	___
9. Participate in school activities	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons	___	___	___	___	___	___
11. Determine student needs and interests	___	___	___	___	___	___
12. Develop long-range and daily plans	___	___	___	___	___	___
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
15. Present lessons effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices	___	___	___	___	___	___
19. Assess and interpret student progress	___	___	___	___	___	___
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures	___	___	___	___	___	___
21. Work effectively with exceptional students	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students	___	___	___	___	___	___
23. Counsel students appropriately	___	___	___	___	___	___
24. Cooperate with all school personnel	___	___	___	___	___	___
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

_____
University Supervisor